

WHITE PAPER



Why Better Answers Begin
With Better Questions

CENTRAL QUESTION

What if the problem you keep trying to solve is not the actual problem?

Dr. Lauran Star

Organizational Psychologist • Forensic Cultural Behaviorist

August 2026

Executive Summary

Organizations are built to solve problems. That strength becomes a liability when action begins before diagnosis. A familiar issue appears—turnover, low accountability, poor execution, weak innovation, burnout, conflict—and leaders reach for a familiar response: a new policy, training program, reorganization, technology platform, communication campaign, or person in charge. Activity increases. The problem returns.

The Rethink Project™ is Dr. Luran Star's proprietary inquiry and action framework for interrupting that cycle. Its premise is simple: before reaching for another solution, leaders must understand what keeps producing the problem. The work asks organizations to Examine Assumptions. Expand Perspectives. Build Better Organizations.

THE PROVOCATION

A recurring problem is often not evidence that the organization needs another solution. It may be evidence that it has defined the problem incorrectly.

The Rethink Project™ operates through four disciplines: THINK → LISTEN → CHALLENGE → BUILD. THINK examines evidence, assumptions, bias, and framing. LISTEN expands the information available through curiosity, voice, and perspectives that power often filters out. CHALLENGE tests inherited explanations, incentives, systems, and one's own certainty. BUILD converts recognition into redesigned decisions, structures, and accountability.

Substantial research supports the mechanisms beneath the model. Framing influences judgment under risk (Kühberger, 2023). Double-loop learning distinguishes correcting an error from examining the assumptions and governing variables that produced it (Argyris, 1977). Intellectual humility involves recognizing the limits of one's knowledge and is associated with learning, openness, and lower receptivity to misinformation (Bowes & Fazio, 2024; Porter et al., 2022). Psychological safety and employee voice determine whether contradictory information reaches decision-makers (Frazier et al., 2017; Hao et al., 2022). Prospective hindsight and premortems help teams surface reasons a decision may fail before commitment hardens (Klein, 2007; Mitchell et al., 1989).

The Rethink Project™ is not anti-action. It is anti-performative action: the expensive theater of solving the visible symptom while protecting the system that keeps reproducing it.

1. Defining The Rethink Project™

The Rethink Project™ is a disciplined method for identifying when an organization is solving the presented problem rather than the producing problem. It makes leaders move upstream—from outcome to pattern, pattern to behavior, behavior to reinforcement, reinforcement to assumption, and assumption to system design.

The presented problem is what the organization can see: missed targets, attrition, conflict, defects, stalled change, low engagement, or customer dissatisfaction. The producing problem is the set of incentives, assumptions, power dynamics, resource choices, and normalized behaviors that repeatedly generate the visible outcome.

What it is—and is not.

Rethinking is not endless analysis, reflexive contrarianism, or refusing to decide until uncertainty disappears. It is a bounded interruption of automatic certainty. The purpose is to improve the problem definition, widen the evidence base, expose consequential assumptions, and build a response that changes the conditions producing the outcome.

THE STANDARD

Do not ask only, “How do we fix this?” Ask, “What would have to be true for this problem to keep making sense inside our system?”

The integrated THINK → LISTEN → CHALLENGE → BUILD model is a proprietary theoretical contribution. Its component mechanisms are research-grounded, but the complete sequence has not yet been independently validated as a causal or psychometric model. Its claims should be tested through longitudinal and multilevel research.

2. The Four Disciplines

DISCIPLINE	THE WORK
01 THINK	Interrogate the frame—separate observation from interpretation. Examine evidence quality, causal assumptions, cognitive bias, missing variables, and the incentives shaping what counts as the problem.
02 LISTEN	Increase the available reality. Seek disconfirming information, frontline knowledge, lived experience, dissent, and perspectives excluded by hierarchy, familiarity, or fear.
03 CHALLENGE	Test the explanation and the system protecting it: question inherited practices, leadership exceptions, institutional norms, and one’s own preferred answer.
04 BUILD	Translate insight into a different operating reality. Redesign decisions, roles, resources, incentives, measures, accountability, feedback, and learning loops.

The disciplines are sequential enough to create rigor but recursive enough to support learning. New listening can change the frame. A challenged assumption can require more evidence. Building generates feedback that should restart thinking rather than close it.

3. Why Organizations Solve the Wrong Problem

Action is rewarded more visibly than diagnosis.

A launched initiative can be announced, funded, and tracked. A corrected problem definition may look like delay—even when it prevents years of wasted execution.

The first frame becomes the container.

Once an issue is labeled a training, communication, engagement, or performance problem, evidence is gathered inside that frame, and other explanations become harder to see.

Power edits the evidence.

Organizations often receive the version of reality that can travel safely upward. Bad news is softened; contradictory data are contextualized away; frontline knowledge arrives after it can still change the decision.

Past investment hardens commitment.

Time, reputation, budget, and executive sponsorship make reconsideration feel like failure. Escalation can become easier than admission.

Familiar solutions protect familiar authority.

A solution can fail operationally while succeeding politically—preserving ownership, hierarchy, narrative, or the appearance of control.

Normalized conditions disappear from the diagnosis.

Chronic understaffing, unequal accountability, meeting overload, poor job design, or leadership avoidance are treated as environmental facts rather than causal variables.

4. The Research Beneath Rethinking

Framing changes judgment

Decision research demonstrates that choices can change when equivalent information is framed differently. Kühberger's (2023) systematic review found that risky-choice framing effects are robust but sensitive to design and context. For organizations, the implication is not that every frame is manipulative. It is that no problem arrives frame-free. Naming the issue determines which evidence appears relevant, which owners become involved, and which solutions seem reasonable.

Double-loop learning questions the governing variables

Argyris (1977) distinguished single-loop learning—correcting error while preserving underlying goals and assumptions—from double-loop learning, which questions the governing variables themselves. A company may improve a performance-management process while leaving intact the incentives, role ambiguity, or leadership inconsistency producing poor performance. The Rethink Project™ begins where single-loop correction stops.

Intellectual humility is disciplined uncertainty.

Porter et al. (2022) define intellectual humility around recognizing limitations in one's knowledge and beliefs. Their review links it to judgment, relationships, learning, and social coordination while noting measurement limitations and contextual tradeoffs. A meta-analysis synthesizing 27 studies and 54 samples found intellectual humility was associated with lower receptivity to misinformation and stronger evidence-based intentions and behavior (Bowes & Fazio, 2024). Rethinking requires leaders to hold conviction without converting confidence into immunity from correction.

Voice determines whether the system can learn.

Frazier et al.'s (2017) meta-analysis of 136 independent samples linked psychological safety to leadership, work design, performance, and citizenship behavior. Hao et al. (2022) synthesized 168 independent samples involving 63,134 employees and found silence associated with leader factors, wellbeing, attitudes, and performance. A leader cannot rethink with information the culture has trained people to withhold.

Dissent can improve cognitive independence.

Research on minority influence shows that dissent can stimulate divergent thought and more independent consideration, even when the minority position is not adopted (Nemeth, 1986). The organizational goal is not disagreement theater. It is to prevent unanimity from being mistaken for rigor when hierarchy, conformity, or self-protection shaped the room.

Prospective hindsight creates permission to see failure.

Premortems ask a team to imagine that a decision has already failed and work backward to explain why. The method builds on prospective hindsight research demonstrating that imagining an outcome as completed can improve the generation of explanations for it (Klein, 2007; Mitchell et al., 1989). Used carefully, it legitimizes concerns that might otherwise sound disloyal or pessimistic.

5. What Current Data Make Visible

DATA	SIGNAL	SOURCE
20%	Global employees engaged in 2025	Gallup, 2026
\$10T	Estimated global productivity cost of low engagement	Gallup, 2026
40%	Global employees reporting substantial daily stress	Gallup, 2026
70%	Respondents hesitant to trust people unlike themselves	Edelman, 2026
63,134	Employees represented in a meta-analysis of silence	Hao et al., 2022

Note. These indicators establish the scale of current decision conditions; they are not prevalence measures of The Rethink Project™. Edelman data come from its proprietary global survey methodology.

Gallup reported that global employee engagement fell to 20% in 2025 and estimated that low engagement cost the global economy \$10 trillion in lost productivity. Forty percent of employees experienced substantial stress the previous day (Gallup, 2026). These figures are not evidence that a single intervention failed. They challenge solution-first thinking: decades of programs have not eliminated the systemic conditions associated with disengagement and strain.

Edelman’s 2026 global survey reported that 70% of respondents were hesitant or unwilling to trust people who differed in values, facts, problem-solving approaches, or cultural background (Edelman, 2026). In polarized conditions, listening becomes harder, certainty becomes socially rewarded, and evidence from an out-group can be dismissed before examination. Rethinking is therefore both an organizational capability and a civic discipline.

6. Where The Rethink Project™ Applies

Turnover

Presented problem: retention. Producing questions: Who leaves, from which leaders, after which experiences, and what system is the organization asking people to survive?

Accountability

Presented problem: employees avoid ownership. Producing questions: Are expectations clear, consequences consistent, authority aligned, and leaders held to the same standard?

Burnout

Presented problem: resilience. Producing questions: Which workload, staffing, role, meeting, technology, and decision systems manufacture unending demand?

Innovation

Presented problem: people need creativity training. Producing questions: What happens to dissent, failed experiments, unpolished ideas, and people who challenge the sponsor?

Change resistance

Presented problem: employees will not adopt. Producing questions: What have past changes taught them about credibility, capability, workload, and follow-through?

Leadership development

Presented problem: managers lack skills. Producing questions: Who was promoted, why, what behavior succeeds, and what will the operating system punish them for changing?

AI transformation

Presented problem: adoption is too slow. Producing questions: Is the work redesigned, is the technology useful, do incentives align, and are people being asked to automate a broken process?

Culture

Presented problem: values are not lived. Producing questions: What does the organization reward, ignore, excuse, protect, fund, and repeatedly normalize?

7. The Cost of Solving the Wrong Problem

- Initiative accumulation. New solutions stack on top of unresolved causes, increasing complexity and fatigue.
- Misdiagnosed people. Employees are trained, coached, monitored, or replaced for adapting rationally to the system.
- Metric theater. Measures improve while the underlying outcome migrates, hides, or reappears elsewhere.
- Credibility loss. Each recycled solution teaches employees that leadership prefers motion to recognition.
- Escalation of commitment. Reputation and investment make correction more expensive and therefore less likely.
- Innovation suppression. Contradictory evidence becomes a threat to ownership rather than an input to learning.
- Strategic delay. The organization spends years becoming more efficient at solving the wrong thing.

THE HIDDEN COST

A wrong solution does more than waste money. It teaches the organization the wrong lesson about why the problem exists.

8. The Rethink Protocol™

01 STATE THE PRESENTED PROBLEM

Write the current explanation in one sentence. Identify who framed it, what evidence supports it, and which facts do not fit.

02 SEPARATE FACT FROM INTERPRETATION

List what is directly observed, what is inferred, and what is assumed. Do not let familiar labels do the analysis.

03 TRACE THE PRODUCING SYSTEM

Map incentives, power, workflow, resources, leadership behavior, exceptions, dependencies, and normalized workarounds.

04 EXPAND THE REALITY

Gather evidence from people closest to the work, people harmed by the outcome, dissenters, customers, data, and adjacent systems.

05 TRY TO DISPROVE THE FAVORITE ANSWER

Use a premortem, red team, rival hypotheses, base rates, and explicit disconfirming evidence.

06 BUILD AT THE CAUSAL LEVEL

Design the intervention to change the producing condition—not merely reduce the symptom's visibility.

07 DEFINE A LEARNING TEST

Specify what result would support the diagnosis, what would disconfirm it, what unintended effects matter, and when the decision will be revisited.

9. Relationship to Dr. Star's Frameworks

The Rethink Project™ is the broader inquiry platform. The Normalization Effect™ diagnoses how repeated exposure, tolerance, and reinforcement change what people and organizations accept as normal. The Culture Infinity Loop™ explains how society, organizations, leaders, and employees continuously shape one another. The Culture Operating Model™ identifies the system layers through which culture is authorized, reinforced, adapted to, and expressed.

FRAMEWORK	PRIMARY QUESTION
The Rethink Project™	Are we solving the actual problem—or the problem as currently framed?
The Normalization Effect™	How did something once questioned become accepted as normal?
Culture Infinity Loop™	How does culture move between society, leadership, organizations, and people?
Culture Operating Model™	Which system layer is authorizing, reinforcing, or adapting to the pattern?

10. A Research Agenda

The next stage is empirical validation. Research should determine whether the four disciplines create incremental value beyond established problem-solving, learning, and decision-quality practices.

- Develop reliable measures of framing rigor, perspective expansion, assumption challenge, and causal-level redesign.
- Test the protocol against conventional solution-first approaches using field experiments and longitudinal designs.
- Measure decision quality, implementation success, rework, learning speed, employee voice, trust, and recurrence of the original problem.
- Examine boundary conditions including crisis, time pressure, hierarchy, regulation, national culture, and problem complexity.
- Compare leader confidence with diagnostic accuracy and openness to disconfirming evidence.
- Test whether psychological safety and accountability jointly predict productive challenge better than either alone.

The framework should not become a license for perpetual reconsideration. A valid Rethink process must end in a testable decision, named ownership, operational change, and evidence capable of proving the diagnosis wrong.

Conclusion

Organizations do not suffer from a shortage of solutions. They suffer from solutions attached to incomplete explanations, protected assumptions, filtered evidence, and problems defined at the level most convenient to address.

The Rethink Project™ asks leaders to interrupt that reflex. THINK clearly enough to see the frame. LISTEN widely enough to encounter what the frame excluded. CHALLENGE courageously enough to risk being wrong. BUILD concretely enough to change the system rather than decorate it.

THE FINAL QUESTION

Before you solve it again: What keeps producing it?

The future will not be built by people who think alike. It will be built by people who think better—and who dare to redesign what their organizations have mistaken for inevitable.

References

- Argyris, C. (1977). Double loop learning in organizations. *Harvard Business Review*, 55(5), 115–125.
- Bowes, S. M., & Fazio, L. K. (2024). Intellectual humility and misinformation receptivity: A meta-analytic review. *Advances in Psychology*, 2(1), Article e940422. <https://doi.org/10.56296/aip00026>
- Edelman. (2026). 2026 Edelman Trust Barometer: Global report. https://www.edelman.com/sites/g/files/aatuss191/files/2026-01/2026%20Edelman%20Trust%20Barometer%20Global%20Report_Final.pdf
- Frazier, M. L., Fainshmidt, S., Klinger, R. L., Pezeshkan, A., & Vracheva, V. (2017). Psychological safety: A meta-analytic review and extension. *Personnel Psychology*, 70(1), 113–165. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12183>
- Gallup. (2026). State of the global workplace: 2026 report. <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/349484/state-of-the-global-workplace.aspx>
- Hao, L., Zhu, H., He, Y., Duan, J., Zhao, T., & Meng, H. (2022). When is silence golden? A meta-analysis on antecedents and outcomes of employee silence. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 37(5), 1039–1063. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-021-09788-7>
- Klein, G. (2007). Performing a project premortem. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(9), 18–19.
- Kühberger, A. (2023). A systematic review of risky-choice framing effects. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, Article 1160517. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1160517>
- Mitchell, D. J., Russo, J. E., & Pennington, N. (1989). Back to the future: Temporal perspective in the explanation of events. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 2(1), 25–38. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.3960020103>
- Nemeth, C. J. (1986). Differential contributions of majority and minority influence. *Psychological Review*, 93(1), 23–32. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.93.1.23>
- Porter, T., Elnakouri, A., Meyers, E. A., Shibayama, T., Jayawickreme, E., & Grossmann, I. (2022). Predictors and consequences of intellectual humility. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 1, 524–536. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-022-00081-9>

About the Author

Dr. Luran Star is an organizational psychologist, forensic cultural behaviorist, executive advisor, author, and founder of The Rethink Project™. Her work challenges leaders and institutions to examine the assumptions beneath recurring problems, expose what systems have taught people to accept, and build organizational realities worthy of the people living inside them.

© 2026 Dr. Luran Star. The Rethink Project™, The Rethink Protocol™, The Normalization Effect™, Culture Infinity Loop™, Culture Operating Model™, and related framework language are proprietary intellectual property. All rights reserved.